arXiv:1409.5584v2 [math.AP] 11 Jun 2016

ON THE SECOND BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEM FOR LAGRANGIAN MEAN CURVATURE FLOW

RONGLI HUANG

Abstract. We consider a fully nonlinear parabolic equation with nonlinear Neumann type boundary condition, and show the long time existence and convergence of the flow. Finally we apply this study to the boundary value problem for minimal Lagrangian graphs.

1. Introduction

Since the work of R.P.Thomas and S.T.Yau [1] about mean curvature flow of Lagrangian submainfolds of Calabi-Yau manifolds, Lagrangian mean curvature flow has been studying by many authors. K. Smoczyk and M.T. Wang obtained the long time existence and convergence of Lagrangian mean curvature flow in some conditions (cf.[2], [3]). The progress on singularity of Lagrangian mean curvature flow made people have a deeper understanding to Thomas-Yau Conjectures such as J.Y. Chen and J.Y. Li [4], A. Neves [5] [6]. Recently several authors took the equation point of view to study Lagrangian mean curvature flow such as [7], [8].

Let Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$ be strict convex bounded domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$. In special Lagrangian geometry, S. Brendle and M. Warren [9] used the method of continuity to prove that there exists a diffeomorphism f: $\Omega \to \tilde{\Omega}$ such that the graph

$$\Sigma = \{(x, f(x))|x \in \Omega\}$$

is a minimal Lagrangian submanifold of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$. The aim of this paper is to provide a parabolic approach to Brendle-Warren' theorem.

Firstly we introduce some relevant works according to solving elliptic equations with second boundary conditions by parabolic approach. To solve an optimal transportation, J. Kitagawa[10] looked for solutions on the following set of boundary value problems:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \ln\det(D^2u - A(x, Du)) = -\ln B(x, Du) & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, & t > 0, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 53C44; Secondary 53A10.

Keywords and phrases. Lagrangian mean curvature flow; Gâteaux derivative; Hopf lemma.

Here A is a matrix value function and B a scalar value function defined on the cost function and two measures related to the transportation. Under certain conditions on $\Omega, \tilde{\Omega}$, A, B and the initial function, he proved the long time existence to the above flow, and convergence to the solution of the optimal transport problem as $t \to +\infty$. In[11], Neumann and second boundary value problems for Hessian and Gauss curvature flows were carefully studied by O.C. Schnurer and K. Smoczyk. They showed that the flow exists for all time and converges eventually to the solution of the prescribed Gauss curvature equation.

Inspired from [10] and [11], we consider the following Lagrangian mean curvature flow with boundary conditions

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \arctan \lambda_i, & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}, & t > 0, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where

$$\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$$

are the eigenvalues of $D^2 u = [u_{ij}]$, and $Du(\cdot, t)$ is a family of diffeomorphisms from Ω to $\tilde{\Omega}$. Along the lines of approach in a work by O.C. Schnurer and K. Smoczyk [11], our main results concern the long time existence and convergence of the nonlinear parabolic flow (1.1) and then obtain the solution to the boundary value problem for minimal lagrangian graphs [9]. Now we can state our main theorem.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$ are bounded, strictly convex domains with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $0 < \alpha < 1$. Then for any given initial function $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ which is strictly convex and satisfies $Du_0(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}$, the strictly convex solution of (1.1) exists for all $t \geq 0$ and $u(\cdot, t)$ converges to a function u^∞ in $C^{1+\zeta}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\bar{D})$ as $t \to \infty$ for any $D \subset\subset \Omega$, $\zeta < 1$, and $u^\infty \in C^{1+1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^\infty(\Omega)$ is a solution of*

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma_{i=1}^{n} \arctan \lambda_i = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases} \tag{1.2}$$

The constant c depends only on Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$ and u_0.

Remark 1.2. *By the methods in* [9]*, the initial function u_0 can be obtained by considering*

$$\begin{cases} \triangle u = c, & x \in \Omega, \\ Du(\Omega) = \tilde{\Omega}. \end{cases}$$

Here the goal is easier to attack because Laplace equation is simpler than special Lagrangian equation.

Remark 1.3. *S. Brendle and M. Warren* [9] *showed that the solution to (1.2) was unique up to addition of constants.*

It's well known that (1.2) is special Lagrangian eqaution with second boundary condition where the solution (x, Du) is a minimal Lagrangian graph in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

Using the method of solving fully nonlinear elliptic equations with second boundary conditions, S. Brendle and M. Warren [9] obtained the existence and uniqueness of the solution to (1.2). As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we proved the existence result of the minimal Lagrangian submanifolds with the same conditions in $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n$.

The plan is as follows for the proof of Theorem 1.1. In Section 2, we establish the local existence result to the flow (1.1) by the inverse function theory. In Section 3, we provide preliminary results which will be used in the proof of the theorem. The techniques used in this section are reflective of those in [12] and [11] to the second boundary value problems for fully nonlinear differential equations, but all of the corresponding a priori estimates to the solution in the current scenario need modification because the structure of (1.1) is unlike Monge-Ampère type. In Section 4, we give the proof of our main results.

2. THE SHORT-TIME EXISTENCE OF THE PARABOLIC FLOW

Throughout the following Einstein's convention of summation over repeated indices will be adopted. Denote

$$u_i = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, u_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, u_{ijk} = \frac{\partial^3 u}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_k}, \cdots,$$

and

$$[u^{ij}] = [u_{ij}]^{-1}, \ \ F(D^2u) = \Sigma_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i, \ \ F^{ij}(D^2u) = \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_{ij}}, \ \ \Omega_T = \Omega \times (0,T).$$

By the methods on the second boundary value problems for equations of Monge-Ampère type [12], the parabolic boundary condition in (1.1) can be reformulated as

$$h(Du) = 0, \qquad x \in \partial\Omega, \quad t > 0,$$

where h is a smooth function on $\bar{\tilde{\Omega}}$:

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n | h(p) > 0\}, \qquad |Dh|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}} = 1.$$

The so called boundary defining function is strictly concave, i.e, $\exists \theta > 0$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\xi_i\xi_j \le -\theta|\xi|^2, \qquad \textbf{for} \quad \forall y = (y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_n) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

We also give the boundary defining function according to Ω (cf.[9]:

$$\Omega = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^n | \tilde{h}(p) > 0\}, \qquad |D\tilde{h}|_{\partial\Omega} = 1,$$

$$\exists \tilde{\theta} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial^2 \tilde{h}}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}\xi_i\xi_j \le -\tilde{\theta}|\xi|^2, \quad \textbf{for} \quad \forall y = (y_1, y_2, \cdots, y_n) \in \tilde{\Omega}, \quad \xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \cdots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Thus the parabolic flow is equivalent to the evolution problem:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \Sigma_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i, & t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h(Du) = 0, & t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega, \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.1}$$

To obtain the short-time existence of classical solution of (2.1) we use the inverse function theorem in Fréchet spaces and the theory of linear parabolic equations for oblique boundary conditions.

Lemma 2.1 ([13], Theorem 2)**.** *Let X and Y be Banach spaces. Denote*

$$J : X \to Y$$

be continuous and Gâteaux-differentiable, with $J(v_0) = w_0$. Assume that the derivative $DJ[v]$ has a right inverse $L[v]$, uniformly bounded in a neighbourhood of v_0:

$$\forall \alpha \in Y, \quad DJ[v]L[v]\alpha = \alpha$$

$$\|v - v_0\| \leq R \Longrightarrow \|L[v] - L[v_0]\| \leq m.$$

For every $w \in Y$ if

$$\| w - w_0 \| < \frac{R}{m}$$

then there is some v such that we have:

$$\|v - v_0\| < R,$$

and

$$J(v) = w.$$

Lemma 2.2 ([14], Theorem 8.8 and 8.9)**.** *Assume that $f \in C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)$ for some $0 < \alpha < 1$, $T > 0$, and $G(x,p)$,$G_p(x,p)$ are in $C^{1+\alpha}(\Sigma)$ for any compact subset Σ of $\partial\Omega \times \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\inf_{\partial\Omega}\langle G_p, \nu\rangle > 0$ where ν is the inner normal vector of $\partial\Omega$. Let $u_0 \in C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ be strictly convex and satisfies $G(x, Du_0) = 0$. Then there exists $T_{max} > 0$ such that we can find an unique solution which is strictly convex in x variable in the class $C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})$ to the following equations*

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - \triangle u = f(x,t), & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ G(x, Du) = 0, & T > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ u = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

According to the proof of [12], one can verify the oblique boundary condition.

Lemma 2.3 (J. Urbas[12])**.**
$u \in C^2(\bar{\Omega})$ with $D^2u > 0 \Longrightarrow \inf_{\partial\Omega} h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k > 0$ where $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \cdots, \nu_n)$ is the unit inward normal vector of $\partial\Omega$, i.e. $h(Du) = 0$ is strictly oblique.

We are now in a position to prove the short-time existence of solutions of (2.1) which is equivalent to the problem (1.1).

Proposition 2.4. *According to the conditions in Theorem 1.1, there exists some $T_{max} > 0$ and $u \in C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})$ which depend only on Ω, $\tilde{\Omega}$, u_0, such that u is a solution of (2.1) and is strictly convex in x variable.*

Proof. Denote the Banach spaces

$$X = C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T), \quad Y = C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T) \times C^{1+\alpha,\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}(\partial\Omega \times (0,T)) \times C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega}),$$

where

$$\| \cdot \|_Y = \| \cdot \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)} + \| \cdot \|_{C^{1+\alpha,\frac{1+\alpha}{2}}(\partial\Omega\times(0,T))} + \| \cdot \|_{C^{2+\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})}.$$

Define a map

$$J: \quad X \to Y$$

by

$$J(u) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} - F(D^2u), & (x,t) \in \Omega_T, \\ h(Du), & (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ u, & (x,t) \in \Omega \times \{t=0\}. \end{cases}$$

The strategy is now to use the inverse function theorem to obtain the local existence result. The computation of the Gâteaux derivative shows that:

$$\forall u, v \in X, \quad DJ[u](v) \triangleq \frac{d}{d\tau} J(u+\tau v)|_{\tau=0} = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} - F^{ij}(D^2u)v_{ij}, & (x,t) \in \Omega_T, \\ h_{p_i}(Du)v_i, & (x,t) \in \partial\Omega \times (0,T), \\ v, & (x,t) \in \Omega \times \{t=0\}. \end{cases}$$

Using Lemma 2.2 there exists $T_{max} > 0$ such that we can find $\hat{u} \in X$ to be strictly convex in x variable, which satisfies the following equations :

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} - \triangle \hat{u} = F(D^2u_0) - \triangle u_0, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h(D\hat{u}) = 0, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ \hat{u} = u_0, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

For each $(f,g,w) \in Y$, using Lemma 2.2 again there exists an unique $v \in X$ satisfying $DJ[\hat{u}](v) = (f,g,w)$, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{\partial v}{\partial t} - F^{ij}(D^2\hat{u})v_{ij} = f, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ h_{p_i}(D\hat{u})v_i = g, & T_{max} > t > 0, \quad x \in \partial\Omega. \\ v = w, & t = 0, \quad x \in \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Then the derivative $DJ[\hat{u}]$ has a right inverse $L[\hat{u}]$ and for $T = T_{max}$ we see that

$$\forall \gamma = (f,g,w) \in Y, \quad DJ[\hat{u}]L[\hat{u}]\gamma = \gamma. \tag{2.3}$$

If set

$$\hat{f} = \frac{\partial \hat{u}}{\partial t} - F(D^2\hat{u}), \quad w_0 = (\hat{f}, 0, u_0), \quad w = (0,0,u_0)$$

then one can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \| \hat{f} - 0 \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} &= \| \triangle\hat{u} - \triangle u_0 + F(D^2u_0) - F(D^2\hat{u}) \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \\ &\le \| \triangle\hat{u} - \triangle u_0 \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} + \| F(D^2u_0) - F(D^2\hat{u}) \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \\ &\le C \| \hat{u} - u_0 \|_{C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant depending only on the known data. We may apply (2.2) to conclude: $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, $\exists T_{max} > 0$ to be small enough such that

$$\| \hat{f} - 0 \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} \leq C \| \hat{u} - u_0 \|_{C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} < \varepsilon.$$

Thus it's obtained

$$\| w - w_0 \|_Y = \| 0 - \hat{f} \|_{C^{\alpha,\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_{T_{max}})} < \varepsilon.$$

Combining with (2.3) and using Lemma 2.1 it gives the desired results. □

Remark 2.5. *By the strong maximum principle, the strictly convex solution to (2.1) is unique.*

3. Preliminary results

In this section, the C^2 a priori bound is accomplished by making the second derivative estimates on the boundary for solution of parabolic type special lagrangian equation. This treatment is similar to the problems presented in [10], [11] and [12], but requires some modification to accommodate the particular situation. Specifically, Corollary 3.3 is needed in order to drive differential inequalities from barriers which can be used.

For the convenience, we set

$$[g^{ij}] \triangleq [\frac{\partial F(D^2u)}{\partial u_{ij}}] = [\delta_{ij} + u_{ik}u_{kj}]^{-1}, \quad \beta^k \triangleq \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial u_k} = h_{p_k}(Du)$$

and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ be the inner product in $\mathbb{R}^n$. By Proposition 2.4 and the regularity theory of parabolic equations, we may assume that u is a strictly convex solution of (2.1) in the class $C^{2+\alpha,1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T) \cap C^{\infty}(\Omega_T)$ for some $T = T_{max} > 0$.

Lemma 3.1 ($\dot{u}$-estimates)**.**
As long as the convex solution to (2.1) exists, the following estimates hold, i.e.

$$0 \leq \dot{u} \triangleq \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} \leq \Theta_0 \triangleq \max_{\bar{\Omega}} F(D^2u_0).$$

Proof. We use the methods known from Lemma 2.1 in [11].

From (2.1), a direct computation shows that

$$\frac{\partial \dot{u}}{\partial t} - g^{ij}\partial_{ij}\dot{u} = 0.$$

Using the maximum principle we see that

$$\max_{\bar{\Omega}_T} \dot{u} = \max_{\partial\bar{\Omega}_T} \dot{u}.$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $\dot{u} \neq constant$. If $\exists x \in \partial\Omega, t > 0$, such that $\dot{u}(x,t) = \max_{\bar{\Omega}_T} \dot{u}$. Then we differentiate the boundary condition and obtain

$$\dot{u}_\beta = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial t} = 0.$$

Since $\langle \beta, \nu \rangle > 0$, it contradicts the Hopf Lemma (cf.[15]) for parabolic equations. So that

$$\dot{u} \leq \max_{\bar{\Omega}_T} \dot{u} = \max_{\partial \bar{\Omega}_T|_{t=0}} \dot{u} = \max_{\bar{\Omega}} F(D^2 u_0).$$

On the other hand, u is convex $\Longrightarrow \min_{\bar{\Omega}} F(D^2 u) \geq 0 \Longrightarrow \dot{u} = F(D^2 u) \geq 0$. Putting these facts together, the assertion follows. □

Since $-\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \arctan \lambda_i \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, $\arctan \lambda_i = \frac{\pi}{2} \Leftrightarrow \lambda_i = +\infty$. Then $\Theta_0 < \frac{n\pi}{2}$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let (x,t) be arbitrary point of Ω_T, and $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_n$ be the eigenvalues of $D^2 u$ at (x,t). Then*

$$0 \leq \lambda_1 \leq \tan(\frac{\Theta_0}{n}). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $F(D^2 u)$ and Lemma 3.1:

$$n \arctan \lambda_1 \leq \Sigma_{i=1}^n \arctan \lambda_i = \dot{u} \leq \Theta_0.$$

Combining with the convexity of u we obtain

$$0 \leq \arctan \lambda_1 \leq \frac{\Theta_0}{n}$$

which yields (3.1). □

Now we can show the operator F to be uniformly elliptic which will play an important role in the barrier arguments.

Corollary 3.3. *For any $(x,t) \in \Omega_T$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{1 + \tan(\frac{\Theta_0}{n})^2} \leq \Sigma_{i=1}^n g^{ii} \leq n.$$

Proof. We observe

$$\Sigma_{i=1}^n g^{ii} = \Sigma_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1+\lambda_i^2}.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{1 + \tan(\frac{\Theta_0}{n})^2} \leq \frac{1}{1+\lambda_1^2} \leq \Sigma_{i=1}^n g^{ii} = \Sigma_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{1+\lambda_i^2} \leq n.$$

□

Returning to Lemma 2.3, using Corollary 3.3 we can get a uniform positive lower bound of the quantity $\inf_{\partial\Omega} h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k$ which does not depend on t.

Lemma 3.4. *As long as the uniformly convex solution to (2.1) exists, the strict oblique estimates can be obtained by*

$$\langle \beta, \nu \rangle \geq \frac{1}{C_1} > 0, \tag{3.2}$$

where the constant C_1 is independent of t.

Proof. Let $(x_0, t_0) \in \partial\Omega \times [0, T]$ such that

$$\langle \beta, \nu \rangle (x_0, t_0) = h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T]} \langle \beta, \nu \rangle.$$

By the computation in [12] it gives

$$\langle \beta, \nu \rangle = \sqrt{u^{ij}\nu_i\nu_j h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl}}. \tag{3.3}$$

Further on, we may assume that $t_0 > 0$ and $\nu(x_0) = (0, 0, \cdots, 1) \triangleq e_n$. As in the proof of Lemma 8.1 in [11], by the convexity of Ω and its smoothness, we extend ν smoothly to a tubular neighborhood of $\partial\Omega$ such that in matrix sense

$$D_k \nu_l \equiv \nu_{kl} \leq -\frac{1}{C}\delta_{kl} \tag{3.4}$$

for some positive constant C. Let

$$v = \langle \beta, \nu \rangle + h(Du).$$

By the above assumptions and the boundary condition, it's obtained

$$v(x_0, t_0) = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T]} v = \min_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T]} \langle \beta, \nu \rangle.$$

In (x_0, t_0), we have

$$0 = v_r = h_{p_n p_k} u_{kr} + h_{p_k} v_{kr} + h_{p_k} u_{kr}, \quad 1 \leq r \leq n-1, \tag{3.5}$$

$$0 \leq \dot{v}.$$

We assume that the following key estimate holds which will be proved later,

$$v_n(x_0, t_0) \geq -C, \tag{3.6}$$

where C is a constant depending only on Ω, u_0, h, and $\tilde{h}$. It's not hard to check that (3.6) can be rewritten as

$$h_{p_n p_k} u_{kn} + h_{p_k} \nu_{kn} + h_{p_k} u_{kn} \geq -C. \tag{3.7}$$

Multiplying (3.7) with h_{p_n} and (3.5) with h_{p_r} respectively, and summing up together we obtain:

$$h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl} \geq -C h_{p_n} - h_{p_k} h_{p_l} \nu_{kl} - h_{p_k} h_{p_n p_l} u_{kl}. \tag{3.8}$$

By the concavity of h, we have

$$-h_{p_n p_n} \geq 0, \quad h_{p_k} u_{kr} = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial x_r} = 0, \quad h_{p_k} u_{kn} = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial x_n} = \frac{\partial h(Du)}{\partial x_n} \geq 0.$$

Substituting those into (3.8) and using (3.4) it yields

$$h_{p_k} h_{p_l} u_{kl} \geq -C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C}|Dh|^2 = -C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C}.$$

According to the above last term, we distinguish two cases.

Case (i).

$$-C h_{p_n} + \frac{1}{C} \leq 0.$$

Then

$$h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k = h_{p_n} \geq \frac{1}{C^2}.$$

It shows that there is a uniform positive lower bound of the quantity $\min_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T]} h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k$.

Case (ii).

$$-Ch_{p_n}(x_0)+\frac{1}{C}>0.$$

Then we obtain a positive lower bound of $h_{p_k}h_{p_l}u_{kl}$. Introduce the Legendre transformation of u,

$$y_i=\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i},\ i=1,2,\cdots,n,\ \ u^*(y_1,\cdots,y_n,t):=\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}-u(x,t).$$

In terms of $y_1,\cdots,y_n,u^*(y_1,\cdots,y_n)$, one can easily check that

$$\frac{\partial^2 u^*}{\partial y_i\partial y_j}=[\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}]^{-1}.$$

Since $\arctan\lambda+\arctan\lambda^{-1}=\frac{\pi}{2}$. Then u^* satisfies

$$\begin{cases}\dfrac{\partial u^*}{\partial t}-F(D^2u^*)=-\dfrac{n\pi}{2}, & T>t>0,\quad x\in\tilde{\Omega},\\ \tilde{h}(Du^*)=0, & T>t>0,\quad x\in\partial\tilde{\Omega},\\ u^*=u_0^*, & t=0,\quad x\in\tilde{\Omega}.\end{cases}\tag{3.9}$$

where $\tilde{h}$ is a smooth and strictly concave function on $\bar{\Omega}$:

$$\Omega=\{p\in\mathbb{R}^n|\tilde{h}(p)>0\},\qquad |D\tilde{h}|_{\partial\tilde{\Omega}}=1.$$

We also define

$$\tilde{v}=\tilde{\beta}^k\tilde{\nu}_k+\tilde{h}(Du^*)=\langle\tilde{\beta},\tilde{\nu}\rangle+\tilde{h}(Du^*),$$

where

$$\tilde{\beta}^k\triangleq\frac{\partial\tilde{h}(Du^*)}{\partial u_k^*}=\tilde{h}_{p_k}(Du^*),$$

and $\tilde{\nu}=(\tilde{\nu}_1,\tilde{\nu}_2,\cdots,\tilde{\nu}_n)$ is the inner unit normal vector of $\partial\tilde{\Omega}$. Using the same methods, under the assumption of

$$\tilde{v}_n(y_0,t_0)\geq -C,$$

we obtain the positive lower bounds of $\tilde{h}_{p_k}\tilde{h}_{p_l}u^*_{kl}$ or

$$h_{p_k}(Du)\nu_k=\tilde{h}_{p_k}(Du^*)\tilde{\nu}_k(y_0)=\tilde{h}_{p_n}\geq\frac{1}{C^2}.$$

We notice that

$$\tilde{h}_{p_k}\tilde{h}_{p_l}u^*_{kl}=\nu_i\nu_j u^{ij}.$$

Then the claim follows from (3.3) by the positive lower bounds of $h_{p_k}h_{p_l}u_{kl}$ and $\tilde{h}_{p_k}\tilde{h}_{p_l}u^*_{kl}$.

It remains to prove the key estimate (3.6). The proof of Lemma 8.1 in [11] can be also adapted here. For the convenience of readers and the completeness, we provide the details and the arguments below.

Define the linearized operator by

$$L=g^{ij}\partial_{ij}-\partial_t.$$

Since $D^2\tilde{h} \leq -\tilde{\theta} I$, we obtain

$$L\tilde{h} \leq -\tilde{\theta} \sum g^{ii}. \tag{3.10}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} Lv =& h_{p_k p_l p_m} \nu_k g^{ij} u_{li} u_{mj} + 2 h_{p_k p_l} g^{ij} \nu_{kj} u_{li} + h_{p_k p_l} g^{ij} u_{lj} u_{ki} \\ &+ h_{p_k p_l} \nu_k L u_l + h_{p_k} L \nu_k. \end{aligned}$$

By estimating the first term in the diagonal basis, one yields

$$\mid h_{p_k p_l p_m} \nu_k g^{ij} u_{li} u_{mj} \mid \leq C \sum \frac{\lambda_i^2}{1+\lambda_i^2} \leq C,$$

where C is a constant depending only on h and Ω. For the same reason, we have

$$\mid 2 h_{p_k p_l} g^{ij} \nu_{kj} u_{li} \mid \leq C, \quad \mid h_{p_k p_l} g^{ij} u_{lj} u_{ki} \mid \leq C.$$

After the simple calculation it gives

$$L u_l = 0.$$

Obviously we have

$$|h_{p_k} L \nu_k| \leq C \sum g^{ii}.$$

So there exists a positive constant C such that

$$\mid Lv \mid \leq C \sum g^{ii} \tag{3.11}$$

Here we use Corollary 3.3 and C depends only on h, Ω and u_0.

Denote a neighborhood of x_0:

$$\Omega_\delta \triangleq \Omega \cap B_\delta(x_0)$$

where δ is a positive constant such that ν is well defined in Ω_δ. We consider

$$\Phi \triangleq v(x,t) - v(x_0,t_0) + C_0 \tilde{h}(x) + A|x-x_0|^2$$

where C_0 and A are positive constants to be determined. On $\partial\Omega \times [0,T)$ it is clear that $\Phi \geq 0$. Since v is bounded, we can select A large enough such that

$$\begin{aligned} &(v(x,t) - v(x_0,t_0) + C_0\tilde{h}(x) + A|x-x_0|^2)|_{(\Omega \cap \partial B_\delta(x_0)) \times [0,T]} \\ &\geq v(x,t) - v(x_0,t_0) - C_0 C + A\delta^2 \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the strictly concavity of $\tilde{h}$ we have

$$\triangle(C_0\tilde{h}(x) + A|x-x_0|^2) \leq C(-C_0\tilde{\theta} + 2A) \sum g^{ii}.$$

Then by choosing the constant $C_0 \gg A$, we can show that

$$\triangle(v(x,0) - v(x_0,t_0) + C_0\tilde{h}(x) + A|x-x_0|^2) \leq 0.$$

It follows from the maximum principle:

$$\begin{aligned}&(v(x,0)-v(x_0,t_0)+C_0\tilde{h}(x)+A|x-x_0|^2)|_{\Omega_\delta}\\&\geq \min_{(\partial\Omega\cap B_\delta(x_0))\cup(\Omega\cap\partial B_\delta(x_0)}(v(x,0)-v(x_0,t_0)+C_0\tilde{h}(x)+A|x-x_0|^2)\\&\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.10) with (3.11), letting C_0 be large enough we obtain

$$L\Phi \leq (-C_0\tilde{\theta}+C+2A)\sum g^{ii} \leq 0.$$

From the above arguments one can verify that Φ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} L\Phi \leq 0, & (x,t)\in \Omega_\delta\times[0,T],\\ \Phi \geq 0, & (x,t)\in(\partial\Omega_\delta\times[0,T]\cup(\Omega_\delta\times\{t=0\}.\end{cases} \tag{3.12}$$

Using the maximum principle we can deduce that

$$\Phi \geq 0, \qquad (x,t)\in\Omega_\delta\times[0,T].$$

Combining it with $\Phi(x_0,t_0)=0$, we obtain $\Phi_n(x_0,t_0)\geq 0$ which gives the desired estimate (3.6), thus complete the proof of the lemma. □

It follows from (3.11) that we can state the following result which is similar to Proposition 2.6 in [9].

Lemma 3.5. *Fix a smooth function $H:\Omega\times\tilde{\Omega}\to R$ and define $\varphi(x,t)=H(x,Du(x,t))$. Then there holds*

$$|L\varphi| \leq C\sum g^{ii}, \quad (x,t)\in\Omega_T,$$

where C is a positive constant depending on h, H, u_0 and Ω.

We can now proceed to do the C^2 estimates. The strategy is to bound the interior second derivative firstly.

Lemma 3.6. *For each $t\in[0,T]$, the following estimates hold:*

$$\sup_{\Omega} \mid D^2u \mid \leq \max_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T]} \mid D^2u \mid + \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \mid D^2u_0 \mid . \tag{3.13}$$

Proof. Given any unit vector ξ, by the concavity of F, $u_{\xi\xi}$ satisfies

$$\partial_t u_{\xi\xi} - g^{ij}\partial_{ij}u_{\xi\xi} = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_{ij}\partial u_{kl}}u_{ij\xi}u_{kl\xi} \leq 0.$$

Combining with the convexity of u, and using the maximum principle we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0\leq |u_{\xi\xi}| = u_{\xi\xi}(x,t) &\leq \max_{\partial\Omega_T} u_{\xi\xi}\\&\leq \max_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T]} \mid D^2u \mid + \max_{\bar{\Omega}} \mid D^2u_0 \mid .\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the estimates (3.13) are satisfied. □

By tangentially differentiating the boundary condition $h(Du) = 0$ we have some second order derivative bounds on $\partial\Omega$, i.e,

$$u_{\beta\tau} = h_{p_k}(Du)u_{k\tau} = 0. \tag{3.14}$$

where τ denotes a tangential vector. The second order derivative estimates on the boundary are controlled by $u_{\beta\tau}, u_{\beta\beta}, u_{\tau\tau}$.

In the following we give the arguments as in [12]. For $x \in \partial\Omega$, any unit vector ξ can be written in terms of a tangential component $\tau(\xi)$ and a component in the direction β by

$$\xi = \tau(\xi) + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle}\beta,$$

where

$$\tau(\xi) = \xi - \langle \nu, \xi\rangle\nu - \frac{\langle \nu, \xi\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle}\beta^T$$

and

$$\beta^T = \beta - \langle \beta, \nu\rangle\nu.$$

After a simple computation it yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\tau(\xi)|^2 &= 1 - (1 - \frac{|\beta^T|^2}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle^2})\langle \nu, \xi\rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi\rangle\frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle} \\ &\le 1 + C\langle \nu, \xi\rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi\rangle\frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle} \\ &\le C, \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

where we use the strict obliqueness (3.2). Let $\tau \triangleq \frac{\tau(\xi)}{|\tau(\xi)|}$. Then by (3.14) and (3.2), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\xi\xi} &= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + 2|\tau(\xi)|\frac{\langle \nu, \xi\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle}u_{\beta\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi\rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle^2}u_{\beta\beta} \\ &= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi\rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle^2}u_{\beta\beta} \\ &\le C(u_{\tau\tau} + u_{\beta\beta}). \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

Along with specifying the boundary conditions we can carry out the double derivative estimates in the direction β.

Lemma 3.7. *For each $t \in [0, T]$, we have the estimates*

$$\max_{\partial\Omega} u_{\beta\beta} \le C_2$$

where $C_2 > 0$ depending only on u_0, h, $\tilde{h}$, Ω.

Proof. We use the barrier functions for any $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$ and thus consider

$$\Psi \triangleq \pm h(Du) + C_0\tilde{h} + A|x - x_0|^2.$$

As the proof of (3.12), we can find the constant C_0 and A, such that we have

$$\begin{cases} L\Psi \le 0, & (x,t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0,T], \\ \Psi \ge 0, & (x,t) \in (\partial\Omega_\delta \times [0,T] \cup (\Omega_\delta \times \{t=0\}. \end{cases}$$

By the maximum principle we get

$$\Psi \ge 0, \qquad (x,t) \in \Omega_\delta \times [0,T].$$

Combining it with $\Psi(x_0,t_0) = 0$ and using Lemma 3.4 we obtain $\Psi_\beta(x_0,t_0) \ge 0$. Furthermore we see from $\beta = (\frac{\partial h}{\partial p_1}, \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_2}, \cdots \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_n})$ that

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial \beta} = \langle Dh(Du), \beta \rangle = \Sigma_{k,l} \frac{\partial h}{\partial p_k} u_{kl} \beta^l = \Sigma_{k,l} \beta^k u_{kl} \beta^l = u_{\beta\beta}.$$

Then it shows that

$$|u_{\beta\beta}| = |\frac{\partial h}{\partial \beta}| \le C_2.$$

□

We shall obtain the bound of double tangential derivative at the boundary.

Lemma 3.8. *There exists a constant $C_3 > 0$ depending only on u_0, h, $\tilde{h}$, Ω such that*

$$\max_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T]} \max_{|\tau|=1, \langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0} u_{\tau\tau} \le C_3.$$

Proof. Assume that $x_0 \in \partial\Omega$, $t_0 \in [0,T]$ and $\nu = e_n$ to be the inner unit normal of $\partial\Omega$ at x_0. Such that

$$\max_{\partial\Omega \times [0,T]} \max_{|\tau|=1, \langle \tau, \nu \rangle = 0} u_{\tau\tau} = u_{11}(x_0,t_0).$$

For any $x \in \partial\Omega$, combining (3.15) with (3.16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{\xi\xi} &= |\tau(\xi)|^2 u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle}^2 u_{\beta\beta} \\ &\le (1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle}) u_{\tau\tau} + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \\ &\le (1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2 - 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle}) u_{11}(x_0,x_0) + \frac{\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle^2} u_{\beta\beta} \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $u_{11}(x_0,t_0) \ge 1$, then by Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.7 we get

$$\frac{u_{\xi\xi}}{u_{11}(x_0,t_0)} + 2\langle \nu, \xi \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, \xi \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \le 1 + C\langle \nu, \xi \rangle^2$$

Let $\xi = e_1$, then we have

$$\frac{u_{11}}{u_{11}(x_0,t_0)} + 2\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1 \rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu \rangle} \le 1 + C\langle \nu, e_1 \rangle^2$$

We see that the function

$$w \triangleq A|x-x_0|^2 - \frac{u_{11}}{u_{11}(x_0,t_0)} - 2\langle \nu, e_1\rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1\rangle^2 + 1$$

satisfies

$$w|_{\partial\Omega\times[0,T]} \geq 0, \quad w(x_0,t_0) = 0.$$

As before, by (3.13) we can select the constant A such that

$$w|_{(\partial B_\delta(x_0)\cap\Omega)\times[0,T]} \geq 0.$$

Consider

$$-2\langle \nu, e_1\rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1\rangle^2 + 1$$

as a known function depending on x and Du. Then by Lemma 3.5 we obtain

$$|L(-2\langle \nu, e_1\rangle \frac{\langle \beta^T, e_1\rangle}{\langle \beta, \nu\rangle} + C\langle \nu, e_1\rangle^2 + 1)| \leq C\sum g^{ii}.$$

Combining it with the proof of Lemma 3.6 we have

$$Lw \leq C\sum g^{ii}.$$

As in the proof of Lemma 3.7, we consider the function

$$\Upsilon \triangleq w + C_0\tilde{h}.$$

A standard barrier argument shows that

$$\Upsilon_\beta(x_0,t_0) \geq 0.$$

A direct computation yields

$$u_{11\beta} \leq Cu_{11}(x_0,t_0). \tag{3.17}$$

On the other hand, differentiating $h(Du)$ twice in the direction e_1 at (x_0,t_0), we have

$$h_{p_k}u_{k11} + h_{p_kp_l}u_{k1}u_{l1} = 0.$$

The concavity of h yields

$$h_{p_k}u_{k11} = -h_{p_kp_l}u_{k1}u_{l1} \geq \tilde{C}u_{11}(x_0,t_0)^2.$$

Combining it with $h_{p_k}u_{k11} = u_{11\beta}$, and using (3.17) we obtain

$$\tilde{C}u_{11}(x_0,t_0)^2 \leq Cu_{11}(x_0,t_0)$$

Then we get the upper bound of $u_{11}(x_0,t_0)$ and the desired result follows. □

Using Lemma 3.7, 3.8, and (3.16), we obtain the C^2 a priori bound on the boundary:

Lemma 3.9. *There exists a constant $C_4 > 0$ depending on h, $\tilde{h}$, u_0 and Ω, such that*

$$\sup_{\partial\Omega_T} |D^2u| \leq C_4.$$

Using it and Lemma 3.6, the following conclusion is thus proven:

Lemma 3.10. *There exists a constant $C_5 > 0$ depending on h, $\tilde{h}$ and u_0, Ω such that*

$$\sup_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij} u \xi_i \xi_j \leq C_5.$$

By the Legendre transformation of u, using (3.9) and repeating the proof of the above lemmas we get the forthcoming result:

Lemma 3.11. *There exists a constant $C_6 > 0$ depending on h, Ω, $\tilde{h}$, $\tilde{\Omega}$ and u_0, such that*

$$\frac{1}{C_6} \leq \inf_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij} u \xi_i \xi_j \leq \sup_{\bar{\Omega}_T, |\xi|=1} D_{ij} u \xi_i \xi_j \leq C_6. \tag{3.18}$$

4. PROOF OF MAIN RESULT

Proof of Theorem 1.1: Now let u_0 be a $C^{2+\alpha}$ strictly convex function as in the conditions of Theorem 1.1. Combining Proposition 2.4 with Lemma 3.11, $\forall T > 0$, $\exists u \in C^{2+\alpha, 1+\frac{\alpha}{2}}(\bar{\Omega}_T)$ which satisfies (1.1) and (3.18). Using the boundary condition, we have

$$|Du| \leq C_7 \tag{4.1}$$

where C_7 be a constant depending on Ω and $\tilde{\Omega}$. By Theorem 1.1 in [16] and Schauder estimates for parabolic equations, for any $\hat{\Omega} \subset\subset \Omega$ and $m \in \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, \}$, we have

$$\sup_{x_i \in \hat{\Omega}, t_i \geq 1} \frac{|D^{2+m} u(x_1, t_1) - D^{2+m} u(x_2, t_2)|}{\max\{|x_1 - x_2|^\alpha, |t_1 - t_2|^{\frac{\alpha}{2}}\}} \leq C_8$$

where C_8 is a constant depending on the known data and $dist(\partial\Omega, \hat{\Omega})$. By *Arzelà – Ascoli* theorem, a diagonal sequence argument shows that for any $\{t_k\}|_{k=1}^{+\infty}$ satisfying

$$\lim t_k = +\infty,$$

there exist a subsequence

$$\{t_{k_j}\}|_{j=1}^{+\infty} \subset \{t_k\}|_{k=1}^{+\infty}$$

and

$$\hat{u} \in C^{1+1}(\bar{\Omega}) \cap C^{2+m}(\Omega).$$

Such that for any $\zeta < 1$ and $x \in \Omega$, we have

$$\lim_{j \to +\infty} \|u(\cdot, t_{k_j}) - \hat{u}(\cdot)\|_{C^{1+\zeta}(\bar{\Omega})} = 0.$$

$$\lim_{j \to +\infty} D^{2+m} u(x, t_{k_j}) = D^{2+m} \hat{u}(x), \tag{4.2}$$

and $\hat{u}$ satisfies (3.18). Then we get

$$h(D\hat{u})|_{\partial\Omega} = 0$$

and

$$\lim_{j \to +\infty} F(D^2 u(x, t_{k_j})) = F(D^2 \hat{u}(x)), \quad x \in \Omega.$$

For each l, differentiating the equation (1.1) by x_l yields

$$\partial_t u_l = g^{ij}\partial_{ij} u_l.$$

Integrating from 0 to t on both sides we obtain

$$u_l(x,t) - u_l(x,0) = \int_0^t g^{ij}\partial_{ij} u_l(x,\sigma)d\sigma.$$

Combining it with (4.1), (4.2), we have

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} g^{ij}\partial_{ij} u_l(x,t) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega.$$

Using this fact along with (4.2), the following equation emerges:

$$g^{ij}\partial_{ij}\hat{u}_l = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad l \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}.$$

Specifically , it is claimed that

$$F(D^2\hat{u}) = C_9, \quad x \in \Omega$$

for some constant C_9 and it follows from (3.18) that $C_9 > 0$. Then the claim of Theorem 1.1 follows from the above arguments. □

Acknowledgment: The author was supported by NNSF of China (Grant No. 11261008) and NNSF of Guangxi (Grant No. 2012GXNSFBA053009) and was very grateful to Institute of Differential Geometry at Leibniz University Hannover for the kind hospitality. The author would like to thank the referee for giving some valuable suggestions which improved the paper.

References

[1] R.P. Thomas, S.T. Yau, *Special Lagrangians, stable bundles and mean curvature flow,* Comm. Anal.Geom. **10** (2002), 1075-1113.

[2] K. Smoczyk, *Longtime existence of the Lagrangian mean curvature flow,* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations. **20** (2004), 25-46.

[3] K. Smoczyk, M.T. Wang, *Mean curvature flows of Lagrangian submanifolds with convex potentials*, J. Differential Geom. **62**(2002), 243-257.

[4] J.Y. Chen, J.Y. Li, *Singularity of mean curvature flow of Lagrangian submanifolds,* Invent. Math. **156** (2004), 25-51.

[5] A. Neves, *Singularities of Lagrangian mean curvature flow: Zero-Maslov class case,* Invent. Math. **168** (2007), 449-484.

[6] A. Neves, *Finite time singularities of Lagrangian mean curvature flow,* Ann. of Math.(2) **177** (2013), 1029-1076.

[7] A. Chau, J.Y. Chen, W.Y. He, *Lagrangian mean curvature flow for entire lipschitz graphs,* Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations. **44** (2012), 199-220.

[8] A. Chau, J.Y. Chen, Y. Yuan, *Lagrangian mean curvature flow for entire lipschitz graphs II,* Math. Ann. **357** (2013), 165-183.

[9] S. Brendle, M. Warren, *A boundary value problem for minimal Lagrangian graphs*, J. Differential Geom. **84**(2010), 267-287.

[10] J. Kitagawa, *A parabolic flow towards solutions of the optimal transportation problem on domains with boundary,* J. Reine Angew. Math. **672** (2012), 127-160.

[11] O.C. Schnuere, K. Smoczyk, *Neumann and second boundary value problems for Hessian and Gauss curvature flows,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **20** (2003), 1043-1073.

[12] J. Urbas, *On the second boundary value problems for equations of Monge-Ampère type,* J. Reine Angew. Math. **487** (1997), 115-124.
[13] I. Ekeland, *An inverse function theorem in Fréchet spaces,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **28** (2011), 91-105.
[14] G.M. Lieberman, *Second order parabolic differential equations,* World Scientific, 1996.
[15] Y.Y. Li, L.Nirenberg, *On the Hopf Lemma,* arXiv:0709.3531V1, 2007.
[16] T.A Nguyen, Y. Yuan, *A priori estimates for Lagrangian mean curvature flow,* Int. Math. Res. Not.IMRN **19**(2011), 4376-4383.

School of Mathematics and Statistics, Guangxi Normal University, Guilin, Guangxi 541004, People's Republic of China, E-mail: ronglihuangmath@gxnu.edu.cn